UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,737	05/04/2005	Johannis F. Blacquiere	NL 021137	4554
	7590 06/24/200 LLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001			ALUNKAL, THOMAS D	
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/533,737	BLACQUIERE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
THOMAS D. ALUNKAL	2627		

	THOMAS D. ALUNKAL	2627	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>27 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI		-	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection E FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wind AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	vogueo.
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
appeal; and/or	parroananding number of finally reig	acted claims	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: see Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.11		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		impliante / imonamone (i	102 02 1).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application ir	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Wayne Young/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2627	/Thomas D Alunkal/ Examiner, Art Unit 2627		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's amendment of claims 1, 4-7, and 9 raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search because the subject matter added to the claims further limits the claims, requiring additional search and/or consideration. More specifically, prior to the proposed amendments, the subject matter of claim 3, which is now incorporated in independent claim 1 recited "a peak/bottom detector at the output of the I operator." In addition, prior to the proposed amendment, the subject matter of claim 4, which is now dependent from independent claim 1 recited "a frequency multiplier for providing pulses, which multiplier is linked to the output of an I operator and from which multiplier angular position information is derived." However, after the proposed amendments, claim 4 now recites "a frequency multiplier for providing pulses, wherein said frequency multiplier is linked to the output of the I operator, and wherein angular position information is derived from said frequency multiplier." That is, the "frequency multiplier" of claim 4 is now linked to "the I operator" of claim 1. Prior to the proposed amendments, claim 4 only required that the "frequency multiplier" be linked to "an I operator", which meant that it could be linked to "an I operator" of claim 2 OR a separate I operator. Therefore, the proposed claims have been narrowed in scope. Furthermore, the proposed amendments raise issues pertaining to 112 1st and 2nd paragraphs. More specifically, based on applicant's specification, the frequency multiplier of claim 4 is linked to the output of a peak/bottom detector rather than "the I operator". Furthermore, claims 1 and 4 both recite where the peak/bottom detector and frequency multiplier are connected or linked to "the output of the I operator" which implies a single output. However, it in unclear from the claims how many outputs are provided at the output of the I operator. Therefore, the proposed amendments will not be entered. Applicant's arguments pertaining to claim 1 are based on the proposed amendments which will not be entered and are therefore rendered moot.